REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 7-9, and 13 are pending.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 5, and 11 were objected to for minor informalities identified by the examiner.

Claims 1, 7-8, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 based on Yamaguchi et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0112345).

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 in view of Yamaguchi and Shimanoto et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0126999).

Claims 3 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 in view of Yamaguchi and Koshiba et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0003578).

Claims 4, 6, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 in view of Yamaguchi, Washino et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,488,433), and Koshiba.

Claims 5 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 in view of Yamaguchi, Washino, Koshiba, and Zane et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0022051).

Claims 10 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 in view of Yamaguchi and Washino.

Claim Objections

As for claim 1, a review of the claim 1 as originally filed and obtained from PAIRS does not reveal any misspelling of "image."

As for claims 5 and 11, these claims have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Section 102 Rejection of Claims 1, 7, and 13

Claims 1, 7-8, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 based on Yamaguchi.

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 7-8, and 13 are not anticipated by Yamaguchi because Yamaguchi fails to teach (or even suggest) each and every limitation of the

subject claims, as amended. Specifically, independent claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended to

more clearly set forth the present invention, thereby distinguishing over Yamaguchi.

1.   Claim 1

Claim 1 recites in pertinent part:

> ... <u>a first image compressing module</u> which encodes said digital image signal to
> first image data according to a first recording format;
> <u>a second image compressing module</u> which encodes said digital image signal to
> second image data according to a second recording format whose coding rate is lower
> than the coding rate of the first recording format;   (emphasis added)

Yamaguchi does not show a first image compressing module and a second image

compressing module. The examiner had cited Yamaguchi's CPU 22 (Fig. 2) for teaching first

and second compression means (originally filed claim 1). However, claim 1 as amended recites

separate modules, namely "a first compression module" and "a second compression module."

Yamaguchi's CPU 22 does not constitute the recited limitations of "a first

compression module" and "a second compression module." For at least this reason, the Section

102 rejection of claim 1 is believed to be overcome.

2.   Claims 1, 7, and 10

Claim 1 further recites in pertinent part:

> ... said first image compressing module and said second image compressing
> module are controlled so as to <u>generate said first image data and said second image data</u>
> <u>in parallel</u>...   (emphasis added)

Claims 7 and 10 similarly recite (for example, claim 7):

> ... encoding said digital image signal to first image data according to a first
> recording format;
> encoding, <u>concurrently with the foregoing step of encoding</u>, said digital image
> signal to second image data according to a second recording format whose coding rate is
> lower than the coding rate of the first recording format;   (emphasis added)

The examiner cited Yamaguchi's Fig. 4 and ¶¶ [0074 - 0075]. Yamaguchi clearly

teaches in the flowchart of Fig. 4 that CPU 22 *either* will perform compression (YES branch

from step 32) or will not perform compression (NO branch from step 32).

Yamaguchi does not show any processing where an image is compressed by two

modules *in parallel* fashion to produce first and second image data. In other words, Yamaguchi

does not teach "id first image compressing module and said second image compressing module are controlled so as to generate said first image data and said second image data in parallel," as recited in claim 1.

Yamaguchi does not show any processing where two encodings are performed concurrently. In other words, Yamaguchi does not teach "encoding said digital image signal to first image data [and] encoding, concurrently with the foregoing step of encoding, said digital image signal to second image data," as recited in claim 7 and similarly in claim 10.

For at least this reason, the Section 102 rejections of claims 1, 7, and 10 are believed to be overcome.

Section 103 Rejections

The Section 103 rejections of the dependent claims are believed to be overcome. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the allowability of their respective base claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/George B. F. Yee/

George B. F. Yee
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
GBFY
61452438 v1